



**PrairieCat Finance Committee
Minutes
Tuesday, January 15th, 2019
3:00 p. m. – 4:30 p.m.**

Registration URL: <https://attendee.gototraining.com/r/3546395986023880705>

1. Call to Order, introductions
Present via GoToMeeting: Carolyn Coulter (PrairieCat), Michael Skwara (HC), Elizabeth Smith (PrairieCat), Angela Campbell (RP), Cindy Bahr (FO), Charm Ruhnke (PU), Rich Ashley (FR), Julie Wayland (PR)

Absent: Jay Kalman (UE), Maria Meachum (WL)

Skwara (Chair - HC) called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. The committee took turns introducing themselves and their libraries.
2. Introduction of Guests and Public Comment
There were no guests or public comments.
3. Approve minutes of 6/20/2018 and 9/20/18 meetings (pp. 2-6)
Motion #1: Ashley (FR) moved and Ruhnke (PU) seconded to approve the 6/20/2018 and 9/20/18 meeting minutes. There was no discussion on the motion. Motion carries by voice affirmation.
4. Update on N8 libraries project, grant information
Coulter (PrairieCat) shared the N8 project is on schedule. The Go Live is set for the week of May 20. The detailed schedule is out and the implementation team is working hard. PrairieCat staff have started to schedule trainings. Usually acquisitions data is not migrated, but the N8 libraries requested migrating the North Suburban and Rockford data. RAILS will absorb that cost.
5. Discussion, brainstorming: PrairieCat fee structure and potential re-evaluation of methods (see attached supporting documentation):
 - a. How PrairieCat fees are currently designed document (pp. 7-8)
Coulter (PrairieCat) said the memo summarizes how the fee structure is designed so the committee has context as we begin this discussion. Coulter said she wants to get feedback from the committee on the fee structure and what is best for the PrairieCat membership.

Ruhnke (PU) said she does not think there is anything wrong with the current fee structure, but she does think it is wise to review the fee structure to see if there is a more equitable way to configure the fees. Ruhnke said she wants to make sure the membership understands that the committee does not think the fee structure is not fair or equitable, but it is part of the committee's due diligence to review the fee structure periodically.

Ashley (FR) agrees with Ruhnke that he does not see a problem with the current structure, but it is part of the committee responsibility to periodically review. Wayland (PR) agreed.

Coulter (PrairieCat) also shared the document that shows the fee percentage of a member library's overall budget.

Ruhnke (PU) asked when the last time there was in depth review of the fee structure. Coulter (PrairieCat) said since she has been working for PrairieCat the fee structure has not been reviewed, and the membership has added the hosting fee and the PUG Day fee. Ruhnke suggested that perhaps every five years the fee structure should be reviewed in depth by the Finance Committee.

Campbell (RP) said she agrees with the rest of the committee that it is a fine structure, but that due diligence is very important. If making the fee percentage of overall library budget more equitable was a goal, then the structure would need to be reviewed. She is not suggesting that it needs to happen, just commenting.

Campbell (RP) asked how the OCLC fees are incorporated. Coulter said the OCLC fees are a part of the Information Services line in expenditures so the fees are distributed across the membership. Coulter said SWAN is using the tax assessment numbers. Ruhnke (PU) asked how Pinnacle does their fee structure. Coulter said she can inquire about CCS fee structure, as well. Ruhnke said she would like to see the other consortia's fee structure then plug in some sample PrairieCat libraries so the committee can see how the structures are different. Skwara (Chair-HC) said looking at a sample of the libraries would be useful and help the committee decide if any of the other structures would be worth investigating.

Coulter (PrairieCat) said if we wanted to move forward with a fee structure after investigating the sample, then she would have to plug in the whole membership to see if we would meet our revenue needs as Campbell (RP) pointed out.

Ashley (FR) said to use Fossil Ridge as part of the sample since they have a bond payment. Coulter (PrairieCat) will use Rock Island, Peru, Princeton, Maple Park, and Creston-Dement. Ruhnke suggested plugging in a Union List library and a school library, too.

Coulter (PrairieCat) said she can share the information with the committee before the next meeting.

- b. Draft PrairieCat budget FY20 (review and discussion) (pp. 9-11)
The final version will be shared at the April Delegates Assembly meeting.

The committee reviewed the below documents as part of their discussion on the fee structure.

- c. Draft PrairieCat appendix A, annotated (pp. 12-13)

- d. Draft PrairieCat appendix A, DA/PUG day (pp. 14-15)
 - e. FY20 Eligibility (percentage of fees as a part of overall budget, public libraries (pp. 16-18)
 - f. SWAN Fees explanation (pp. 19-23)
 - g. SWAN Fees draft spreadsheet (pp. 24-26)
6. Public Comments
7. Adjournment

Next meeting: March 21, 2019, 2:00 – 4:00pm via GoToMeeting.